

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJRRGY_83275</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determining the Risk Factors and Causes of Stillbirths at GPHC</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijrrgy.com/index.php/IJRRGY/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Initially, I would like to congratulate the authors for the study initiative.</p> <p>It is always difficult to study the subject from a tertiary care unit when it is not associated with very detailed prenatal care data, but even so, the data are always interesting.</p> <p>The approach that the authors make in the introduction supports the arguments and objectives of the study, approaching the theme in a broad and focused way, as well as based on adequate studies.</p> <p>The proposed methodology was adequate for the purpose for which the study was proposed, although I did not see any greater need to select a parameterization sample, but it helped to give an idea of the public served at the institution and this ended up strengthening the study.</p> <p>The results were adequate and the way in which they were presented were intelligible, but the formatting is always relevant to what the journal requires to facilitate the reviewers' understanding.</p> <p>The discussions focused on the results relatively compared with other studies and with previous results from the institution itself that was the scenario of the study.</p> <p>There is a doubt about the epidemiology of stillbirths in the country and whether the institution is representative for this, but it depends on new comparative studies.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Perhaps I have not noticed somewhere in the article the justification for the sum of male and female stillbirths not being 37. Note that there are 35 in table 2.</p> <p>I suggest putting the Macerated stillbirth while fresh stillbirths data that are in figure 2 in table 2, but I'm sorry if I didn't identify them.</p> <p>I suggest that the discussion makes it quite evident that the data are an institution and that to extrapolate them to the general population deserves further comparative studies.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edson José de Carvalho Magacho
Department, University & Country	SUPREMA, Brasil